

File -
IOTAC

16 February 1959

MEMORANDUM FOR: PP/C/PROP

SUBJECT: OSI RECOMMENDATIONS RE MONITORING AND ESTIMATES

25X1A9a

1. [redacted] forwarded their October-November 1958 trip report (Encl A) AD/BI in November 1958. AD/BI comments on the report caused [redacted] to request [redacted] "to clarify" their recommendations. They have rewritten them (see Encl B). At the 3 February IOTAC meeting [redacted] asked that I report DDP reaction to the recommendations at the next IOTAC meeting on 3 March.

2. I do not agree with the premise on which these recommendations are based: that "sufficient data are now available to make reasonably accurate estimates of broadcast reception in each European satellite". We know very little about reception in Bulgaria, and, as Huston and Martin pointed out at the Munich Seminar, we are just beginning to learn about rural reception in Rumania (no local jamming is believed to exist south and east of the Carpathians). Knowing so very little about the behavior of local urban jammers, I do not believe we can state that "certain urban reception is practically impossible", and let it go at that. Degrees of urban and rural jamming may vary from time to time in the future. I believe that OSI should consider urban and rural jamming as variable factors, and should recognize that detailed reporting of such variation will be of value to the broadcasters.

3. I believe that the first recommendation stated in Englosure B might read: "principal collection effort be devoted to obtaining data on the USSR, China, and those satellite countries wherein exact coverage has not been determined, particularly Bulgaria and Rumania".

4. I suggest that recommendation "b" be amended to read "For those principal cities of the USSR and European satellites on which data exists, the intelligence collection and analyses effort be limited to that necessary to detect significant changes in reception", etc.

5. With regard to recommendation "c", CPP, in forwarding RL Brussels Fair collateral reception information to OSI, suggested that

these reports and similar collateral information be considered by OSI in its preparation of estimates of technical effectiveness. This Division has also emphasized to OSI the need to study all available information. I do not believe we should contradict ourselves. OSI states that "this type of data does not contribute materially to estimates of broadcast reception". This depends upon the meaning of "materially". (It is true that a report which states "I have heard Radio Liberation" is not much help in determining what kind of signal was received where, when and under what circumstances.)

I believe that OSI's main interest with regard to collateral information is to relieve itself of the responsibility for collecting collateral data. Perhaps [REDACTED] should be responsible for making collateral data on RFE and RL available to OSI.

25X1A8a

But, no matter who obtains it, I believe that OSI should realize its worth and continue to use it.

6. With regard to recommendation "d", in view of the little that is known of local jamming, I tend to agree with OSI's questioning of the value of IBM collation of peripheral monitoring data.

7. [REDACTED] contends that the motivation for these recommendations is the desire to focus more attention on internal monitoring and the need to strengthen the internal monitoring effort.

25X1A9a

8. OSI would like a DDP reaction to these recommendations at the next IOTAC meeting on 3 March. May I have your instruction with regard to discussing these recommendations with IO Division.

25X1A9a



Attachments A & B